

**AUG 10 2007**Application Serial No. 10/674,013  
Amendment and Response to May 11, 2007 Non-Final Office Action**REMARKS**

Claims 1 – 6, 8 – 11, 13 – 15, and 17 – 23 are in the application. Claims 1, 14, 22, and 23 are currently amended; claims 19 and 21 were previously presented; claims 7, 12, and 16 are canceled, and claims 2 – 6, 8 – 11, 15, 17, 18, and 20 remain unchanged from the original versions thereof. Claims 1, 14, 22, and 23 are the independent claims herein.

**Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103**

Claims 1 – 6, 8 – 15, and 17 – 23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yoakum et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,658,095, hereinafter "Yoakum" in view of "SIP (Session Initiation Protocol) in Enterprise-Class IP Telephony Networks", White Paper, Communication without boundaries, 2002, Avaya Inc. (hereinafter "Avaya"), cited by applicant. This rejection is traversed.

Regarding the rejection of claim 1, Applicant respectfully notes that claim 1 relates to a method that includes configuring a first device as an associated device in a system where the first device is associated and not registered with the system, and receiving information regarding a second device from a device management component, the second device being registered with the system. Clearly, the claimed first device is an associated device that is associated and not registered with a system and a second device is registered with the system. Applicant notes that claims 14, 22, and 23 are, relevant to the current 35 USC 103(a) rejection, worded similar to claim 1.

The Office Action states, "Yoakum does not expressly teach that the first device is not registered with the system". Applicant agrees with the Office and further submits that the cited and relied upon Yoakum is silent regarding the "registration" of a device with the disclosed presence system. As a matter of fact, Yoakum is primarily concerned with the presence of a user and the devices associated with the user. In using the term "associated" for the device, Yoakum does not use the term "associated" relative to or in relationship with a registration status of the device. That is, whether a

Application Serial No. 10/674,013  
Amendment and Response to May 11, 2007 Non-Final Office Action

device is registered with a (presence) system in the context of being "associated" with an individual user is not clarified or of any apparent distinct importance to Yoakum. Again, Yoakum does not disclose or even suggestion any relationship between the "association" of a device with a user and the registration of the same device with a system.

Applicant notes that the use of the term "associated" for a device by Yoakum appears to have no more significance than that the device is somehow related to the user (for example, used by the user). An "associated" device is not disclosed or suggested as being registered with a system, whether some of the time, none of the time, or all of the time. Again, Yoakum provides no direction regarding a relationship between a device "associated" with a user and a registration of the same device with a system.

Therefore, Yoakum does not disclose or suggest the claimed "associated and not registered device". Yoakum merely teaches a device that is associated with a user. Yoakum provides no disclosure regarding a device "associated" with the system.

The Office Action cites and relies upon Avaya for disclosing both SIP- enabled and non SIP-enabled devices being associated with a user. Applicant notes that the claimed device is "associated and not registered" with the claimed *system*. The Office Action interprets the non SIP-enabled devices associated with the Avaya system as not being registered with the SIP system. Based on this assumption, the Office Action concludes it would have been obvious at the time of Applicant's invention to modify the method of Yoakum with the "non-registered" devices as taught by Avaya.

Applicant reiterates that Yoakum fails to disclose or suggest that the devices therein are registered or not registered with the system. Instead, Yoakum discloses the devices are associated with the user. However, combining the disclosures of Yoakum and Avaya as alleged by the Office Action (not admitted as feasible by Applicant) would result in associating with the user of Yoakum both SIP- enabled and non SIP-enabled devices.

AUG 10 2007

Application Serial No. 10/674,013  
Amendment and Response to May 11, 2007 Non-Final Office Action

Applicant further submits that the independent claims herein, i.e., claims 1, 14, 22, and 23, are not limited to an SIP system and/or SIP devices.

Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited and relied upon combination of Yoakum and Avaya fails to render claims 1, 14, 22, and 23 obvious under 35 USC 103(a), for at least the reasons discussed in detail above.

Claims 2 – 6, 8 – 11, and 13 depend from claim 1; and claims 15 and 17 – 21 depend from claim 14. Applicant further submits that claims 2 – 6, 8 – 11, 13, 15, and 17 – 21 are also patentable over Yoakum and Avaya under 35 USC 103(a) for at least depending from patentable base claims.

Accordingly, Applicant requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 1 – 6, 8 – 11, 13 – 15, and 17 – 23 under 35 USC 103(a).

### CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned via telephone at (408) 492-5336.

Date: 10 Aug 07

SIEMENS CORPORATION  
Customer Number: 28524  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

David D. Chung  
Registration No. 38,409  
Attorney for Applicants  
Direct Dial: 408-492-5336  
Dept. Fax: 408-492-3122